Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at Loyola Marymount University

March 2010

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the accreditation visit conducted at Loyola Marymount University. The report of the team presents findings based upon a thorough review of the Institutional Self-Study reports, supporting documentation, and interviews with representative constituencies. Based upon the findings of the team, an accreditation recommendation is made for this institution of **Accreditation**.

Common (NCATE Unit) Standards and Program Standard Decisions
For all Programs offered by the Institution

	Initial	Advanced
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills, and Professional Dispositions	M	M
2) Assessment System and Unit Evaluation	M	M
3) Field Experiences and Clinical Practice	M	M
4) Diversity	M	M
5) Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development	M	M
6) Unit Governance and Resources	M	M
CTC Common Standard 1.1 Credential Recommendation Process	M	M
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	M	M

Program Standards

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Multiple Subject, with Internship, w/BCLAD, Spanish and Mandarin	19	19		
Single Subject, with Internship, w/BCLAD, Spanish and Mandarin	19	19		
Multiple and Single Subject Clear	4	4		
Education Specialist: MM Level I	17	17		
Reading Certificate	11	11		
Reading Language Arts Specialist	9	9		
California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)	10	10		
Preliminary Administrative Services	15	15		
Professional Administrative Services	9	9		

Programs	Total Standards	Program Standards		
		Met	Met with Concerns	Not Met
Pupil Personnel Counseling: School Counseling	32	32		
Pupil Personnel: School Psychology w/Intern	27	27		

The site visit was completed in accordance with the procedures approved by the Committee on Accreditation regarding the activities of the site visit:
- Preparation for the Accreditation Visit
- Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report
- Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team
- Intensive Evaluation of Program Data
- Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Institution: **Loyola Marymount University**

Dates of Visit: **March 14-16, 2010**

Accreditation Team
Recommendation: **Accreditation**

Rationale:
The unanimous recommendation of **Accreditation** was based on a thorough review of the institutional self-study; additional supporting documents available during the visit; interviews with administrators, faculty, candidates, graduates, and local school personnel; along with additional information requested from program leadership during the visit. In addition, team members used feedback from Program Assessment summary and confirmed findings that standards are met.

The decision pertaining to the accreditation status of the institution was based upon the following:

Common Standards
The decision of the team regarding the six NCATE standards is that all standards are met. The decision of the team regarding the parts of California's two Common Standards that are required of NCATE accredited institutions is that both standards are met.

Loyola Marymount piloted the new Continuous Improvement NCATE model. In this model, an Off-Site Visit was held in December. The Off-Site Visit was conducted as a conference call with web support with team members reviewing the Institutional Report as well as evidence in the electronic document room at the LMU website. An Off-Site report was generated as a result of the review. LMU responded to questions noted in the report. The visit then gathered information related to unanswered questions and confirmed the findings. The CTC State Lead and Consultant participated in the Off-Site Review as did four members of the Site Visit team (including one of the CA team members on the NCATE cluster).

Program Standards
For all eleven credential programs, all program standards are met.

Overall Recommendation
Therefore the overall recommendation of the team is **Accreditation**.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

Initial/Teaching Credentials	**Advanced/Service Credentials**
Multiple Subject	Clear SB 2042 Credential
Multiple Subject	
Multiple Subject Internships	California Teachers of English Learners (CTEL)
Multiple Subject BCLAD	
Spanish & Mandarin	Reading Certificate
	Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential
Single Subject	
Single Subject	
Single Subject Internships	Administrative Services
Single Subject BCLAD	Preliminary including Internship
Spanish & Mandarin	Professional
Education Specialist Credentials	Pupil Personnel Services
Preliminary Level I	School Counseling
Mild/Moderate Disabilities, including	School Psychology including Internship
Internship	

Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.

- Loyola Marymount University be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- Loyola Marymount University continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuation of the present schedule of accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Accreditation Team
Joint NCATE-CTC Accreditation Team

NCATE Co-Chair	**Kim Boyd** Oral Roberts University, OK
California Co-Chair:	**Jo Birdsell** National University, CA
NCATE/Common Standards Cluster:	**Ana Maria Schuhmann** William Paterson University, NJ
	James G. Bennett Warsaw High School, NY
	Nina Potter San Diego State University, CA
	Curtis Guaglianone CSU, Bakersfield, CA
Programs Cluster:	**Helene Mandell** University of San Diego, CA
	Barbara Wilson California Department of Education, Retired
	Gary Railsback Point Loma Nazarene University, San Diego, CA
	Cameron McCune Fullerton School District, Retired
Staff to the Accreditation Team	**Teri Clark**, Administrator **Paula Jacobs**, Consultant **Mary Rice**, Consultant

Documents Reviewed

Institutional Self Study
Course Syllabi and Guides
Candidate Files
Program Handbooks
Survey Data
Candidate Performance Data
Biennial Reports and CTC Feedback
Program Assessment Documentation
Program Assessment Preliminary Findings
Program Assessment Summaries

Candidate Work
Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae
College Annual Reports
College Budget Plan
LMU Website
Accreditation Website
Program Evaluations
Meeting Agendas and Minutes
University Catalog

Interviews Conducted

	Team Lead/ NCATE Cluster	Initial/ Teaching Programs	Advanced/ Services Programs	TOTAL
Program Faculty	42	13	37	92
Institutional Administration	10	3	3	16
Candidates	23	39	32	94
Graduates/Completers	18	27	27	72
Field Supervisors	2	6	12	20
Credential Analysts and Advisors	0	9	6	15
Employers	11	10	6	27
Advisory Boards	13	4	9	26
			TOTAL	362

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one cluster (especially faculty) because of multiple roles.

NCATE STANDARDS/CCTC COMMON STANDARDS

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Brief overview of the institution and the unit.

Loyola Marymount is a Catholic university in the Jesuit and Marymount educational traditions. These traditions are based on the spiritual philosophy of Ignatius of Loyola, and are referred to as *Ignatian Spirituality*. This spiritual worldview has influenced an international set of secondary and tertiary schools for the past 450 years. The educational philosophy that guides these schools is referred to as the Ignatian educational tradition. This tradition can be described by six major characteristics that are central to Jesuit education: (1) a pervading philosophy, (2) a personal concern for the whole life of each student, (3) a striving for excellence, (4) an emphasis on critical thinking and effective communication, (5) development of a broad liberal education, and (6) a commitment to a faith that does justice (McGovern, 1988, pp. 31-33). The LMU School of education embraces its Ignatian heritage and Jesuit and Marymount traditions as it provides a fundamental context for its mission and vision.

The School of Education (SOE), operating within the only Catholic university in the greater Los Angeles area, embraces public, charter, private and Catholic school communities and prepares leaders to serve all people through inclusive, diverse, and multicultural dimensions (Banks, 2000). The Catholic university's dynamic presence in a pluralistic society, and responsibility for shaping future educational leaders, is faithful to the best in our intellectual tradition, when it provides a voice that leaves no educational constituency out of the conversation of educating our youth (Buckley, 1998).

The School of Education is organized into six departments. They are:
> Elementary and Secondary Education (EDES)
> Educational Support Services (EDSS)
> Educational Leadership (EDLA)
> Language and Culture in Education (EDLC)
> Specialized Programs in Urban Education (EDUR)
> Clinical Education (EDCE)

Within the unit there are seventeen different credential/degree programs offered. Initial credentials may be earned at the undergraduate or graduate level. Both advanced degrees and credential programs are offered by the institution.

2. Summary of state partnership that guided this visit (i.e., joint visit, concurrent visit, or an NCATE-only visit). Were there any deviations from the state protocol?
The visit was a joint NCATE/CTC visit. There were no deviations from the state protocol.

3. Indicate the programs offered at a branch campus, at an off-campus site, or via distance learning? Describe how the team collected information about those programs (e.g., visited selected sites, talked to faculty and candidates via two-way video, etc.).
The one advanced program that had previously been offered via distance learning is on hiatus due to low enrollment. All other programs are offered at the main location, some using a hybrid

on-ground and on-line model. Candidates, faculty and others involved in the hybrid programs came to the sites to speak to the site visit team.

4. Describe any unusual circumstances (e.g., weather conditions, readiness of the unit for the visit, other extenuating circumstances) **that affected the visit.**
There were no unusual circumstances that affected the visit.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK
The conceptual framework establishes the shared vision for a unit's efforts in preparing educators to work effectively in P–12 schools. It provides direction for programs, courses, teaching, candidate performance, scholarship, service, and unit accountability. The conceptual framework is knowledge based, articulated, shared, coherent, consistent with the unit and institutional mission, and continuously evaluated.

II. 1 Provide a brief overview of the unit's conceptual framework and how it is integrated across the unit.
As a living document, the Conceptual Framework (CF) permeates the courses, programs, assessment, and activities in the unit. It provides an underlying structure that informs and frames the entire unit and gives meaning and direction through an articulated rationale for the operation of the unit. The seven tenets of the SOE CF are the foundation of the knowledge base, professional dispositions, and institutional standards: social justice; integration of theory and practice; sociocultural/constructivist perspective; culturally responsive pedagogy; technology; community collaboration; and leadership, and is based on the following mission of the university: the encouragement of learning; the education of the whole person; and the service of faith and the promotion of justice.

The unit's conceptual framework provides the foundation for ensuring coherence across the curriculum, instruction, field experiences, clinical practice, internships, and assessment for all programs. Candidates enrolled in initial and advanced programs must complete a course sequence designed to provide the knowledge, skills, and dispositions essential for professionals who embrace the qualities of competence, social consciousness, and reflection. As a faith-based college, critical dispositions are an important part of the campus community mission. The unit uses the acronym REAL to help all unit stakeholders keep the work of the unit focused on the elements of the CF. The characteristics for all SOE candidates to possess are: "R" for respect, "E" for educate, "A" for advocate, and "L" for lead. The unit outcomes are:
> Respect and value all individuals and communities
> Educate by integrating theory and practice
> Advocate for access to a socially just education
> Lead in order to facilitate transformation

1.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The overall evidence during the site visit confirmed the materials presented in the institutional report reflect the status of the education unit and that LMU meets this standard. There are elements that are acceptable with other elements that are at or near the target level.

Through review of candidate work samples and conversations with candidates, faculty, program completers, and community members there is clear evidence that candidates posses an in-depth knowledge of the content that they plan to teach as described in professional, state, and institutional standards (Target). In California, before a candidate can complete final student teaching, they must pass the California Subject Matter Exam for teachers. This is the State's method of establishing "Highly Qualified" status; therefore, all (100%) program completers at LMU have passed the content examination for licensure prior to recommendation toward an internship credential or preliminary teaching credential (Target). Candidates in advanced programs for teachers as determined by interviews and discussions with faculty and university supervisors have an in-depth knowledge of the content that they teach (Acceptable). Both candidates and graduates talked about learning strategies, their confidence about being in the classroom, and their ability to meet the learning needs of all students. Candidates and employers both stated, and this is confirmed by evidence from employer surveys, that candidates possess and in-depth knowledge of their subject matter.

Teacher candidates understand the relationship of content and content- specific pedagogy delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards as evidenced by course assessment data, alumni and graduate data, and confirmed by interviews with candidates and employers. Candidates are able to describe their knowledge of instructional strategies that draws upon content and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in professional, state, and institutional standards to help all students learn. Candidates were able to clearly discuss the teacher performance assessment, teacher performance expectations, and the California Standards for the Teaching profession. Candidates in every program were able to tie their preparation, teaching, and work in the field back to the Unit's Conceptual Framework and the Mission of the University. There is clear evidence of the link between the CF, Mission, and the real work of teaching in the lives of these candidates and faculty.

Work samples from student teaching provide evidence of student learning of the content through presentation of the content in clear and meaningful ways and through to the integration of technology. Candidates and faculty in basic and advanced programs discussed the importance of technology for teachers. They use technology to continuously improve their practice and teaching which demonstrates an in-depth understanding of the content of their field. Candidates were able to explain their use of instructional strategies and technologies that promote student

learning and clearly explained the choices to use one strategy over another, or adapt the curriculum for special need learners, or taking time out to readjust the learning environment. The majority of evidence for this standard reflects a level at acceptable. One area that seems to be closest to the target in this section is the use of technology. There are several examples that were presented during interviews with advanced candidates and graduates to assume their ability and competence to present academic content to students in challenging, clear, and compelling ways, using real-world contexts and integrating technology appropriately.

There is clear evidence that candidates understand and successfully complete the Teacher Performance Assessments that support their knowledge of the California Teacher Performance Expectations. Candidates apply their professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills to facilitate learning in K-12 classrooms and beyond as supported by conversations with advisory board members, employers, university supervisors and survey data. There were many passionate stories from graduates about their ability and practice of considering the school, family, and community contexts in which they work. Many of the candidates in the program work in urban inner city areas with great levels of poverty and clearly articulate their experiences and efforts to provide meaningful learning experiences for all students. Once again, this effort is enhanced by the candidates' or graduates' reflections on the University mission of social justice and the application of the school theme of Reflect, Education, Advocate, and Lead. Candidates at LMU are reflective practitioners and express their personal level of expectation and professional obligation to reflect upon their work.

There is ample evidence to support candidates' ability to analyze educational research findings. The incorporation of new information into their practice seems to happen more at the university course level than out in the field placements. Candidates seem to be able to discuss the research, but application to real world settings was not consistently evident. Candidates in advanced programs for teachers were better able to reflect on their practice and seemed to be able to identify their strengths and areas of needed improvement. Candidates talked about their desire to be better at assessing student work for program improvement, leading grade level teams to implement more effective differentiated instructional practices, and implementing the use of data response systems to monitor classroom learning.

There is ample evidence that the unit takes it's mission of social justice seriously and ensures candidates' understanding of the school, family, and community contexts in which they work. Students made reference to social services and faith based organizations that they are involved with or will be able to collaborate with to create, enhance, and maintain meaningful learning experiences for all students. Candidates in the regular program as well as those programs geared toward Catholic education are aware of current research and policies related to schooling, teaching, learning, and best practices associated with both public and private school education.

Candidate work samples, signature assignments, and interviews with candidates affirm that candidates in all programs assess and analyze student work with a focus on learning. Candidates and graduates from several programs were able to describe modification to instruction through differentiated learning methodology, classroom management techniques, or technology integration, monitor student progress and improve learning in the classroom. These modifications were due to online, in time, or on the spot assessments to adjust for developmental

levels, prior experiences, or need to re-teach; three site administrators verified this. Advanced programs for teachers have a thorough understanding of the theories based on Marzano, Stiggins, McNiff, and others related to assessing student learning and regularly apply these in their practice. Evidence from assessment data, signature assignments, and interviews with graduates and district partners affirm candidates' ability to analyze student, classroom, and school performance data and make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning so that all students learn. School and community resource utilization was a consistent part of the conversation with all constituents due to that fact that doing so aligns with the Unit's mission of social justice.

In order to move programs closer to target in this element of the standard, it would be beneficial to candidates in the program, if they had the knowledge and skill to take more of an intentional approach to analyze student, classroom, and school performance data, reflect upon the data as it relates to the school environment, and make data-driven decisions about strategies for teaching and learning with these data.

Other School Programs candidates, employers, advisory board members, graduates, and employers clearly know their students, families, and communities. "This is a vocational experience," stated one student, and an advisory board member/employer agreed that students choose this program because of their mission and desire to serve the challenging students in this region. Employers verified that graduates of these programs have an in-depth understanding of the knowledge expected in their fields. Candidates were able to name professional, state, and institutional standards and policy related to their learning and apply theoretical models to use data and current research to inform their practices. Technology is infused throughout the curriculum of other school programs to support student learning and leading instructional programs and student success. Community contexts are part of the focus of all programs incorporating the mission of social justice in all activities, curriculum, assignments, and clinical experiences.

Every group of candidates, graduates, employers, and advisory board members described the work with students, families, colleagues, and communities in ways that reflect the professional dispositions expected of professional educators. The University mission of Social Justice permeates all aspects of teaching, learning, and practice of the education unit. The Candidate dispositions of Respect, Educate, Advocate, and Lead are demonstrated in classroom behaviors that create caring and supportive learning environments and encourage self-directed learning by all students. Every group of candidates, graduates, employers, faculty, and advisory board members were able to address these dispositions but demonstrated their own professional dispositions that were implemented to meet the needs of all learners. The dispositions are assessed in all programs at varying points within the programs, and clear evidence of growth and adjustment in candidates' own dispositional development was evident.

Items addressed regarding Off Site Visit:
LMU has different types of programs offered, some lead to state credentials, some lead to masters only, and others lead to certification to work in private schools. During the site visit, the education unit provided ample evidence and documentation to clarify this question of the team.

Findings on programs from the state team reviews provided information for Programs leading to California credentials. These programs are reviewed two years prior to the site visit in the Program Assessment process. LMU programs reviewed in advance were found to have all program standards preliminarily met. These findings were confirmed at the site visit through additional document review and interviews. One program document, Educational Administration was reviewed on site. All program standards were found to be met in that program as well. Program assessment documents that respond to state standards were provided during the visit in the document room, as were aggregated GPA data to support candidate content knowledge.

BOE team members reviewed three years worth of data at the unit level, which addressed one of the concerns during the off-site visit. At the program level 2 rounds of data were observed for all programs. Data from programs that were not listed in Table 2 of the IR were embedded in other programs and were accounted for during the visit and members of the team reviewed data for all programs.

Different data values are used across programs but the team determined that values were consistent within programs and consistency across programs, although a good idea, is not required by the standard. Clarification of the naming protocols of proficiency levels from program to program – Acceptable, Emerging, Meeting expectations, and others was requested and the team determined that naming protocols were consistent within programs and consistency across programs, although a good idea is not required by the standard.

Assessments of dispositions in the ISLA or Ed.D. programs, although not reported in the IR were clarified during the visit and determined to be appropriate. Plans for improving the response rates on graduate surveys for Ed.D, ISLA, and Counseling programs is under review and consideration by the unit. A task force has been established to address this and overall program improvement within the unit in these areas. Candidates in these programs feel positively about the quality of the program and their level of preparation to meet the needs of students upon completion.

1.2. Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
In 2005, the Education Unit at LMU implemented LiveText, which became a mechanism to get faculty working toward continues improvement through the use of rubrics to guide review and assess student work, technology to benefit students and faculty in the advanced use of technology, defining student learning outcomes, and the use of data to drive instruction and program improvement. The implementation of LiveText helped the unit prepare for the accreditation visit by forcing conversations about program improvement, student learning, and data driven decisions. This tool provided opportunities toward data analysis, an effective assessment system, and data analysis by program, which exposed gaps and highlighted strengths that were then used to guide conversations within and across the unit for program improvement.

Clinical Education has also been an area of continuous improvement for the unit. Recently seven FTE faculty have been assigned to facilitate clinical practice with an intentional focus on improving the work of candidates participating in clinical practice. The increase in staff has allowed the tracking of all candidates providing a coaching and mentoring model of support.

The "Critical Care Unit" established for Clinical Education continually identifies needs with a response to intervention approach. The goal is to identify needs, provide immediate coaching and support, and help all candidates to be successful in the field.

A task force has been created for the Ed.D. Program to begin a review and strengthening of the program. The task force, made up of program faculty, will undertake a rigorous review of the curriculum and program design. They will work toward better alignment within the program with program goals, as well as professional, state, and national guidelines and standards.
Other goals of the task force are to review and restructure where needed, key assignments and courses, signature assignments, and imbed dissertation work throughout the program.

Admission and recruitment implemented improved procedures and actions based on feedback from student surveys: Orientation moved from 1 time per year to 4 times per year; orientation now includes the dean, associate dean, advisors, financial aid, bookstore, and one-card information; orientation is offered at a more convenient time for students; moved more operations to an online format; they re-launched the unit's web site with more information, a feedback option for student comments and updated FAQs; and program orientations are now offered regionally.

1.3. Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)**? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?**

Not applicable for spring 2010 pilot visits

1.4. Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
There are two elements of Standard 1 that have some areas that are at the target level. Candidates possess an in-depth knowledge of the content that they plan to teach as described in professional, state, and institutional standards; and all program completers at LMU have passed the content examination for licensure prior to recommendation toward an internship credential or preliminary teaching credential. Candidates work with students, families, colleagues, and communities in ways that reflect the professional dispositions expected of professional educators demonstrated in classroom behaviors that create caring and supportive learning environments and encourage self-directed learning by all students. The dispositions are assessed in all programs with clear evidence of growth and adjustment in candidates' own dispositional development.

1.5.   Areas for Improvement and Rationales None

1.6. Recommendation for Standard 1
Initial Teacher Preparation - Met
Advanced Preparation – Met

California State Team Decision: Standard is Met

Standard 2: Assessment System and Unit Evaluation
The unit has an assessment system that collects and analyzes data on applicant qualifications, candidate and graduate performance, and unit operations to evaluate and improve the performance of candidates, the unit, and its programs.

2.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit has developed an assessment system which is tied to their conceptual framework, state and national standards. They have a clear plan for collecting data at various points in the programs to monitor candidate progress and program and unit operations. A review of reports, and discussions with faculty and candidates during the onsite review collaborated that the plan was being implemented. The assessment system is continuously monitored and evaluated. An assessment committee meets regularly to review the assessment system and discuss current assessment practices. Interviews with the assessment committee members affirm that they are examining current assessment practices and developing ways to improve upon them.

Each program has identified key candidate assessments to be used at each transition point. Signature assignments have been created for most courses and candidates are given feedback about their progress throughout their programs. In order to eliminate bias and increase fairness in assessment practices, the unit has invested resources to develop rubrics for each signature assessment. Faculty were provided with training on creating rubrics and faculty worked together to create rubrics for each assessment. Candidates are provided with rubrics and examples of exemplary work so that they know what is expected of them. Candidates indicate that they feel well supported throughout the programs. Candidates report that they receive regular feedback from both faculty and peers on projects and their progress towards meeting standards.

Assessment data is stored in LiveText which gives candidates, faculty and administrators access to data on a regular basis. Faculty who teach the same course review the data together and discuss reasons for differences in scores. These discussions have lead to changes in rubrics, changes in instruction, and changes in course design. Data from coursework, candidate surveys, and feedback from employers and graduates are used regularly to make programmatic and unit decisions.

The unit assessment system includes plans for when data is to be collected and identifies the person or people responsible for data collection and analysis. Most of the data for candidates, program and unit level decisions is collected and analyzed in LiveText. By having common signature assessments in courses, faculty and administrators can disaggregate data for candidates in different programs or delivery models. Additional candidate demographic information is also stored in LiveText so that assessment data can also be disaggregated by ethnicity and gender.

In addition to course assessment data, the unit keeps track of candidate enrollment, exit survey data, and graduate and employer survey data. Each program is required to submit an annual assessment plan that includes an analysis of the data collected and examples of programmatic changes made as a result of the data. A review of these reports shows that the data has been analyzed and reflected upon. Conversations with current candidates and recent graduates also

indicate that they felt their opinions were listened to and that they had a voice in making programmatic recommendations. Faculty spoke to the importance of listening to the candidates' opinions about what they learned in order to make programmatic improvements.

External stakeholders indicate that data is shared with them in committee meetings, advisory councils and in community-wide presentations such as the Dean's Convocation. The unit regularly uses surveys in order to get feedback from faculty and staff when new initiatives are implemented. Reports were reviewed that provided evidence that faculty and staff indicate that they feel that they have input into unit level changes based on data from survey results and interviews with students.

Formal complaints are kept in the associate dean's office. The unit was able to provide a report of complaints and resolutions since spring 2004. Protocols require that students first approach their instructor with the complaint. If the complaint cannot be resolved, the candidate may take the complaint to the chair. In the event that the chair and candidate cannot come to agreement on a resolution, the candidate can take the complaint to the associate dean. Depending on the issue and policy involved, the associate dean may render a decision, make a recommendation to the dean, or convene a panel to hear the complaint. Candidates are notified of the resolution of their complaints in writing.

2.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
The unit has made significant changes to improve its assessment system and the use of data for programmatic and unit level decisions since the previous visit. LiveText was adopted and is currently being used by all programs except the Ed.D. program. The Ed.D program does have an assessment plan and collects and analyzes data regularly. Signature assignments have been developed for each course and the faculty have developed common rubrics for these assessments. In addition, programs are required to submit annual assessment reports that include a summary of data and description of programmatic changes made in response to the data analysis

2.3 Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?
Not applicable for Spring 2010 pilot.

2.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
The unit, with the involvement of its professional community, is regularly evaluating the capacity and effectiveness of its assessment system, which reflects the conceptual framework and incorporates candidate proficiencies outlined in professional and state standards. The unit regularly examines the validity and utility of the data produced through assessments and makes modifications to keep abreast of changes in assessment technology and in professional standards. Decisions about candidate performance are based on multiple assessments made at multiple points before program completion and efforts are being made to more systematically gather information from candidates in practice after completion of programs. The data are disaggregated by program when candidates are in alternate route, off-campus, and participating

in distance learning programs. Candidates and faculty review data on their performance regularly and develop plans for improvement based on the data.

2.5 Areas for Improvement and Rationales
None

2.6 Recommendation: Met (Initial)
                            Met (Advanced

AFIs Corrected from last visit:
The unit does not systematically aggregate and analyze data to improve candidate performance and program quality. (ITP & ADV)

Rationale
Since implementing LiveText for collecting assessment data and developing signature assessments with common rubrics, the unit now systematically aggregates and disaggregates data to improve candidate performance and program quality.

California State Team Decision: Standard is Met

Standard 3: Field Experiences and Clinical Practice
The unit and its school partners design, implement, and evaluate field experiences and clinical practice so that teacher candidates and other school professionals develop and demonstrate the knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions necessary to help all students learn.

3.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

Evidence examined onsite confirms the Offsite BOE Feedback Report findings that the unit continues to meet the standard. Language from the conceptual framework imbues and informs professional development activities and instructional programs in the partner school settings. Interviews with candidates and program completers, with master teachers and program leaders reveal a strong and clearly stated commitment to the tenets of the conceptual framework. Students spontaneously referenced REAL (Respect, Educate, Advocate, and Lead) as an essential element in forming their professional outlook. One elementary candidate repeatedly emphasized the power of collaboration between school partners and the unit in enhancing pedagogy and practice in his field work. Other candidates and program completers concur and add that the support received from the unit faculty and leadership extends beyond the field experience. Feedback on candidate performance from school-based faculty is reportedly consistently excellent and congruent with that of unit-based faculty. Candidates and program completers assert that school-based faculty reflect the unit's dedication to transformational education, citing the research of both Paulo Freire and Jonathan Kozol as foundational elements of the design, implementation, and evaluation of field experiences and clinical practice. The school partners espouse the same philosophies and utilize the same research as the unit to shape an educational experience for candidates and their students that strives for social justice and transformation. Interviews with candidates, program advisors, and department heads, as well as with constituent school personnel reflect the idea that all stakeholders share responsibility for shaping the education of the area students.

Candidates report sharing plans and strategies learned in unit classes with master teachers, and materials gleaned from master teachers with unit professors and classmates. A collaborative and cohesive atmosphere is established and maintained among the various stakeholders of the unit's constituencies. As noted in the offsite report, the unit boasts strong collaborative partnerships with a variety of public and parochial school districts and positive involvement with their other constituencies through the Partners in Los Angeles Catholic education (PLACE), Catholic Archdiocesan School Teachers (CAST), Teach for America (TFA), and Family of Schools (FOS) programs.

Since the last visit, the unit has established the Department of Clinical Education comprised of seven full time staff who ensure the quality and diversity of field experiences. Interviews with the assistant dean administering the program along with review of syllabi and signature assignments for required core courses reveal that the department ensures that all candidates' field experiences meet diversity requirements. However, some candidates in newer, smaller advanced programs indicate that their placements are not well coordinated by the clinical office. It is unclear if the remaining confusion about coordination of placement is due to the candidates' not

yet having been placed in all of their settings due to the newness of the programs, or to some other factor.

Field experiences are monitored through required signature assignments and LiveText submissions of weekly journals on each strand of the Conceptual Framework REAL. The unit lesson plans (initial) and research projects (advanced) are tied to REAL. Candidates in the Institute of School Leadership and Administration (ISLA) program, for example, create "meaningful projects focusing on advocacy oriented and transformative leadership, and emphasizing school-home-community partnerships."

Candidates' results as measured by CPSELs (California Professional Standards for Educational Leaders), (15/17 meet or exceed expectations in all areas), project panel reviews, and ISLLCs (Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium) indicate consistent success in reaching the program goal of creating transformational leaders in education.

The team found evidence that mentors are assigned to each intern and that clinical practice for all candidates includes a university supervisor. The unit's response to the Offsite Report noted that "feedback from school-based faculty and partners is solicited at the Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education Advisory Board meetings, Intern Advisory meetings, SOE Board of Visitors (unit advisory board) meeting, and the Principals' Breakfast. There is also continual communication between school-based faculty and Clinical Education staff at school site visits and in emails, phone calls, LiveText drop in sessions, orientations, trainings, and professional development activities." While this feedback is less structured, codified, and easily reportable, onsite interviews confirm that this feedback is helpful, meaningful, and "continuous and frequent."

3.2. Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
In 2005, the unit piloted the use of LiveText to manage and monitor candidate assessments. Interviews with candidates and program completers indicate widespread and enthusiastic endorsement of this management tool. Candidates state that unit faculty routinely text or email them if they fail to enter assignments in a timely manner in order to ensure candidate proficiency with the process. Despite minor difficulties with browser incompatibilities (Apple's Safari browser did not work), students find the software easy to use and the feedback garnered form its use invaluable and timely.

In 2006, the unit created the Department of Clinical Education to coordinate and oversee placement and clinical practice of students in initial licensing programs at both the graduate and undergraduate levels. Field work in advanced programs is not overseen by this department, but most graduate programs are small enough to need less unit oversight.

The unit has created or enhanced collaborative partnerships with constituent groups via specialized programs in urban education including LMA/LA CAST, LEAD, PLACE, TFA, MAST, and The Family of Schools. Signature assignments on a large sampling of syllabi are more clearly aligned with the tenets of REAL and advocacy of diversity. Examples include the Final Ethnographic Research Paper (EDLC 6100—a required course for many programs) the

English Language Development Profile (Education 5003), and the signature assignments for ISLA, ECE, and the literacy programs.

"In 2007, the deans of the School of Education, Bellarmine College of Liberal Arts, the College of Communication and Fine Arts, and the Seaver College of Science and Engineering came together to form the Center for Undergraduate Teacher Preparation (CUTP). CUTP provides assistance and support to future teachers in ways that encourage them to be engaged learners, critical thinkers, and socially responsible citizens" [IR 4-5].

3.3. Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)**? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?**
Not applicable for spring 2010 pilot visits

3.4. Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
The unit has created or enhanced collaborative partnerships with constituent groups via specialized programs in urban education including LMA/LA CAST, LEAD, PLACE, TFA, MAST, and The Family of Schools. The level of integration and collaboration among the stakeholders is "incredible" according to a number of participants in interviews with program directors, master teachers, program completers, candidates, and school administrators.

Interviews with candidates and program completers at both the initial and advanced levels demonstrate that the unit and its school partners share expertise and integrate resources to support candidate learning, extend the unit's conceptual framework into practice through modeling by clinical faculty and master teachers (and by the candidates themselves), and candidate learning is integrated into school programs and practice.

Candidates observe and are observed by others, interacting with teachers, families, administrators, and other interns "regularly and continually." Elaboration in interview revealed a strong emphasis on weekly journal reflections and sharing seminars that provide ample opportunity for collaboration and mutual assistance. Collaborative projects imbue the programs enriching the pedagogy and practice of all participants.

3.5. Areas for Improvement and Rationales
None

3.6 Recommendation: Met (Initial)
                                 Met (Advanced)

AFIs Corrected from last visit:
The unit does not ensure that a mentor is assigned for each intern. (ITP & ADV)

Rationale
A clear process for assigning mentors is in place. There are written agreements signed by both the district that employs the mentor and the site-supervisor who provides support to the intern.

California State Team Decision: Standard is Met

1.Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

In addition to the evidence discussed in the offsite report, evidence discovered during the onsite visit reinforces the conclusion that the unit continues to meet this standard. The offsite report indicates that the acronym REAL anchors the philosophy, theory, and pedagogy of the unit, but conversations with unit administrators, program completers, candidates, and partners reveal the depth that this philosophy permeates instruction. The professional dispositions listed on many course syllabi coupled with the repetition of the Conceptual Framework within many program descriptors indicate a level of commitment to diversity and respect for all students. Yet the interviews with the candidates and their various peers, advisors, instructors, and mentors reveal a thorough and holistic adherence to the "tenets of Paulo Freire and Jonathan Kozol." Candidates spoke fervently about the need to "contextualize learning," to work with the whole student in the context of his school, his family, and his neighborhood- and to honor that context and to advocate for equity and justice. The university's mission to encourage learning, educate the whole person, and the service of faith and the promotion of justice is reflected in its approach to candidates, school partners, in hiring and retaining its own faculty and staff.

While diversity is a strength of the faculty members at LMU, candidates at the initial level have more opportunities to interact with faculty from diverse backgrounds than those at the advanced level. While faculty teaching at the initial level are 49% White, 18% Latino, 26 % African American, and 1% Native Hawaiian/ Pacific Islander, and 3% Asian, the advanced faculty members are 71% White, 12% Latino, 4% African American and 6% Asian. The unit makes strong efforts to recruit and retain faculty from diverse ethnic, cultural, religious, and linguistic backgrounds. The language in ads for faculty positions includes statements honoring and seeking diversity, and all members of search committees are trained in discussing and advocating for issues related to diversity. Interviews with junior faculty members confirmed that retention and tenure-track support is provided through a mentor system wherein mentor and mentee meet several times each term to address concerns and progress to tenure. School-based faculty members are a diverse group as well, reflecting the demographics of the Los Angeles area where the unit is located.

Initial and advanced candidates at LMU have opportunities to engage in professional educational experiences with peers from diverse backgrounds. Fifty percent of initial and 55 % of advanced candidates are persons of color. During interviews candidates and program graduates stated that they are encouraged to work collaboratively with peers from backgrounds other than their own in classes and field work. They were able to reflect on these experiences and articulate how these interactions have enhanced their own learning.

The unit's location virtually guarantees candidate field placement in districts and schools that provide experiences and opportunities for candidates to develop knowledge, skills and professional dispositions in working with students of diverse ethnicities and socioeconomic status. The unit makes concerted efforts to ensure field placement opportunities working with English Language Learners and students with special needs. Development of professional dispositions for working with these latter groups is ensured by the purposeful modification of lesson plans. Candidates interviewed state that they are required to include modifications for ELL and special needs students whether or not any are in their classes. Candidates in Special Education and general education programs state that they are not explicitly taught to work with each other to jointly modify lesson plans before placement in the field, but that they quickly learn to do so because "collaboration is such an important part of [the unit's] philosophy."

4.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
The unit continues to foster programs of outreach and support for stakeholders and constituent groups in the community it serves. Several advanced programs are serving only their first or second cohorts, but are modeling strong service commitments to their target populations. The Early Childhood Education Program was begun in 2008; its first cohort will graduate in May 2010. Interviews with candidates reflect very strong commitments to diverse populations. The ECE itself is ethnically diverse: 25% Asian/Pacific Islander, 31% Latina, 31% Caucasian, and 13% African American.

The unit Family of Schools is "dedicated to the transformation and reformation of public education." The FOS fosters supportive partnerships, research opportunities and accountability measures resulting in "significant gains in the Academic Performance Index scores and California High School Exit Examination passage rates at FOS schools." This is an example the unit cites as working meaningfully with constituencies of diverse ethnicities and socioeconomic status to empower, reform, and transform themselves.

3. Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)**? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?**
Not applicable for Spring 2010 Reports

4, Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
The conceptual framework is imbued with celebration of diversity. Course syllabi and candidate evaluations are rife with planning for and assessment of diversity in student and candidate populations. The demographics of faculty, candidate, and student population are diverse. The SOE houses a variety of centers and new programs which provide further opportunities for candidates and faculty to interact across diverse populations (LEAD, CMAST, CEEL, FOS, ECE).

4.5. Areas for Improvement and Rationales
None

4.6 Recommendation: Met (Initial)
                            Met (Advanced)

AFIs Corrected from last visit:

The unit does not have a system to track whether all candidates have opportunities in their field placements to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. (ITP)

Rationale
The Signature Assignment Candidate Proficiency Data Related to Diversity in Initial candidate programs is indicative of a system to track diversity opportunities. The Department of Clinical Education, created since the last visit, has a system to insure that candidates seeking state credentials have experiences with diverse P-12 student populations.

AFI Continued from last visit:
The unit does not have a system to track whether all candidates have opportunities in their field placements to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to help all students learn. (ADV)

Rationale
Ambiguity remains about certainty of diversity in placement in some advanced programs. It is unclear whether some advanced candidates are completing their placements entirely in the classrooms in which they are employed. Some candidates report that alternate placements are encouraged and or arranged; others indicate that this is not always the case. It is hard to find conclusive evidence that the unit ensures experiences with diverse P-12 students for all advanced candidates.

California State Team Decision: Standard is Met

Standard 5: Faculty Qualifications, Performance, and Development
Faculty are qualified and model best professional practices in scholarship, service, and teaching, including the assessment of their own effectiveness as related to candidate performance; they also collaborate with colleagues in the disciplines and schools. The unit systematically evaluates faculty performance and facilitates professional development.

5.1 Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?

The unit at LMU employed 42 full-time faculty members in the 2008-2009 academic year. According to the IR, of those 42, 26 were tenured or tenure-track and 16 were term faculty. Currently, the unit employs 27 tenure-track, 11 term or clinical faculty, and two visiting faculty members. All tenure-track faculty and tenured faculty are qualified for their positions and hold the doctorate degree. Term faculty members are hired annually and most carry teaching as well as administrative responsibilities. Some have nine months contracts while others are employed on a 10 or 11 month assignment. Of the term faculty currently employed in the spring 2010 semester, seven have masters degrees, (two of them are enrolled in doctoral programs), and the rest have the terminal degree. Term faculty members are not required to be engaged in scholarship or service, even though a review of their Faculty Service Reports indicates that many are. In interviews with a number of term faculty members, some indicated a need for more specific job descriptions and more participation in the governance of the departments to which they are assigned.

The load for full-time tenured and tenure-track faculty members is 3/3 while for term faculty it is 4/4. Because many of the full-time faculty members receive reduction in load for administrative and other responsibilities, the unit employs 141 part-time faculty members of whom 81 are fieldwork supervisors. All 81 field work supervisors have extensive experience in schools. Of the 60 part-time faculty who teach courses, 21 have the doctorate degree. Even though the highest degree is an MA from LMU for 20 of the 60 part-time instructors, they demonstrate solid expertise and experience as practitioners in the fields in which they are teaching.

The IR lists the qualifications of 458 school-based faculty who supervise or mentor unit candidates. All hold valid credentials or have the equivalent experience.

Tenure and tenure-track faculty at LMU are engaged in scholarship. As mentioned previously, there is no requirement or expectation that full-time term or clinical faculty members engage in scholarship. Thirty-three full-time faculty members made presentations in the last three years.

The IR states that "one hundred percent of full-time faculty are involved in service activities". An updated list documenting faculty service as well as interviews and other reports provide evidence that tenure-track faculty members are engaged in service in the internal and external communities. As stated previously, there is no requirement or expectation that the term faculty engage in service, although a review of their faculty folders and yearly reports indicate that many do so.

Evaluation of faculty performance for tenure-track faculty is comprehensive. All full-time faculty members, including term faculty, complete an annual Faculty Service Report (FSR) in which they delineate and reflect on their teaching, scholarship (if applicable), and service activities and accomplishments. In addition, they outline future goals and receive feedback from department chairs who review the documents. Once the chairs review the FSR, they discuss the faculty member's performance with the associate dean for faculty and the dean. Faculty files reviewed by the team confirm that each faculty member being evaluated receives a formal letter of feedback followed by a meeting with the department chair.

All faculty members' teaching is evaluated every term using student course evaluations. The evaluations are reviewed by program directors, chairs, and the associate dean for faculty. Any faculty member teaching a course for the first time is evaluated by candidates at the mid-term point in the semester. Results are shared with the instructor by the program director or chair. Summary of course evaluations provided to the team indicate that faculty members perform well on teaching. Candidates cited many examples of instructional strategies modeled in their classes. Interviews confirmed that chairs meet with faculty members to provide feedback on the course evaluations. Junior faculty members are provided a faculty mentor.

Substantial and sustained opportunities for professional development for faculty in the unit are available through activities offered by the SOE, the institution's Center for Teaching Excellence, Sponsored Projects, Institutional Effectiveness, the Center for Spirituality, Mission and Ministry, and Intercultural Affairs. In addition, considerable funds are available for full-time faculty to travel to professional meetings and conferences.

5.2 Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?

Since the last NCATE visit in 2003, the unit has improved in a variety of ways regarding Standard 5 according to faculty members interviewed. Faculty members indicate that there has been an increased support for research and scholarly activities. This includes course reductions, fellowships, graduate assistants, etc. Additionally, faculty members indicate that policies and procedures for tenure and promotion have increased in their transparency. A third area where continuous improvement has occurred is the collaboration within the unit and with the surrounding schools. There is evidence that the unit has increased its commitment to the community at large since the last visit.

A fourth area that has improved is the restructuring of the School of Education from two to five academic departments. This restructuring has allowed for better feedback and support for the faculty.

Finally, an important component of the continuous improvement for faculty has been the professional development opportunities available to them in the area of technology. Two full-time instructional technologists are assigned to the School of Education to provide the faculty with training and support. In addition, the university's Faculty Innovation Center (FIC) provides support and advancement of technology-enhanced teaching, learning, and research.

5.3 Movement to the target level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)**? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?**

Not applicable for spring 2010 visits.

5.4 Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?

Professional Development-Experienced professional education faculty members mentor junior faculty. The unit as well as the university has practices that encourage tenure track faculty members to be continuous learners, particularly in the area of new technologies.

5.5 Areas for improvement and Rationales

None

5.6 Recommendation: Met (Initial)
                                 Met (Advanced)

California State Team Decision: Standard is Met

Standard 6: Unit Governance and Resources
The unit has the leadership, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources, including information technology resources, for the preparation of candidates to meet professional, state, and institutional standards.

6.1. Overall Findings. What did the evidence reveal about the unit continuing to meet this standard?
The School of Education has the primary responsibility, authority, budget, personnel, facilities, and resources for planning, delivering, operating, and assessing programs for the preparation of candidates in initial and advanced programs to meet professional, state, and institutional standards. The unit is managed and coordinated through the office of the dean, three associate deans, two assistant deans, the School of Education Council, five department chairs, 12 academic program directors, four assistant academic program directors, a unit-wide committee structure, and the SOE Board of Visitors.

Members of the professional community are instrumental participants in program design, implementation, and evaluation through service on advisory councils, participants in course activities and field experiences, and through involvement in assessing candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions.

Candidates have access to an array of campus and unit academic and personal support services. Faculty advisors and mentors provide student advocacy and access or referral for appropriate interventions. The unit differentiates between academic advising and professional advising. Academic advising concerns course sequencing, enrollment, and credential requirements, navigating the University and collection of required program documents to ensure candidates finish their course work in a timely manner and meet all requirements. Professional advising involves faculty serving as mentors, assisting students with networking, and providing advice and counseling regarding the profession of education. Each candidate is assigned an academic advisor. The unit has hired two academic advisors, allowing the faculty more time to assist candidates in a professional advising capacity.

University and unit policies for candidate recruitment and admission are described clearly and consistently in print and online materials. According to the IR, in addition to the marketing and advertising efforts of Graduate Admissions, the unit has its own recruiter. Transition points for candidate progression through programs are found on websites and in candidate handbooks.

Previously, the SOE budget had operated on a centralized budget model under the academic affairs division of the university. A decision was made at the senior level of the university to allow the SOE to function more autonomously and thus, to operate on a revenue-based budget model. The new budget model has resulted in the unit's budget to grow exponentially. Over the last seven years, the budget has more than tripled. While this new budget model makes it impossible to compare the unit's budget with other units on campus, it is evident the unit has the necessary resources to support its programs.

Unit faculty are effectively engaged in teaching, scholarship, and service. Support for faculty professional development opportunities are provided by the university and the unit. Faculty suggest that the unit allocation of funds for professional travel, conference presentations, scholarly activities, and instructional enhancement is very generous.

Faculty workloads may include course assignments, candidate advisement and supervision, service in P-12 schools, leadership and administrative activities, and scholarship and research activities. The workloads for unit faculty are well within the NCATE guidelines. As referenced in the LMU Response to Offsite BOE Feedback Report, the teaching load for LMU tenure-line faculty is three/three. Tenure-line faculty also receive a one class reduction in each of their first two years. When faculty undertake administrative responsibilities their teaching loads are adjusted accordingly. In addition to the adjustment of teaching loads, some administrative responsibilities are compensated monetarily. Faculty workload documents reviewed verify that most faculty members carry administrative responsibilities and therefore have course reduction loads.

To accommodate the reduction in full-time faculty course loads, adjunct faculty are recruited, selected, and employed based upon program needs and their requisite expertise and professional experience. A cadre of long-standing adjuncts and field supervisors contribute to the integrity, coherence, and quality of the unit and its programs and understand the conceptual framework of the unit.

The unit has sufficient support personnel, facilities, library resources, and information technology to support teaching and learning and the assessment of initial and advanced candidate knowledge, skills, and dispositions. There is ample evidence of initial and advanced candidates' competence and commitment to the use technology. The unit employs a team of support personnel that undergird the work of the unit. The staff, including support staff, administrative staff, advisors, personnel devoted to assessment, development staff, and instructional technology support, has grown from 11 in 2003 to 45 in 2010. Additionally, the unit employs 105 student workers, up from 41 in 2003. Student workers are assigned as teaching assistants, research assistants, graduate assistants, and work study students.

The new William H. Hannon Library opened in July 2009, is comprised of 120,928 square feet. The state-of-the-art library houses more than 500,000 books, 2,000 print journals, 20,000 electronic journals, 50,000 e-books, and 200 databases.

According to faculty and candidates, the campus facilities and unit facilities are more than adequate to support candidate learning. The School of Education is housed in University Hall. The university commissioned a space study that showed the SOE was under resourced in its space allocation. Based largely on the results of this study, the space allocated to the unit has grown by more than a third since its last visit. The unit currently occupies more than 28,000 square feet.

The unit's technology committee consists of eight individuals, seven of which are solely dedicated to the support of the unit. Two instructional technology support staff members offer on-going technical support, professional workshops, and one-on-one assistance to faculty to

ensure technology is appropriately integrated throughout the curriculum. The classrooms throughout campus, including University Hall, are all equipped with *SMART* classroom technology that allows faculty and candidates to use technology to develop instructional strategies. Level 3 of the library is the location of the Faculty Commons and Innovation Center, designed to provide faculty with a place to explore new technologies for teaching and learning.

6.2. Continuous Improvement. How has the unit been engaged in continuous improvement since the previous visit?
The unit has demonstrated a commitment to engage in continuous improvement. Since its last onsite visit the unit has made substantial changes in governance and resources. The unit leadership has increased significantly to support the growth and expansion of its programs and P-12 partnerships. Moving to a revenue based-budget model has allowed the unit to almost triple its budget since the last onsite visit. Full-time faculty positions have almost doubled and staff positions have increased by 34 to provide increased support to candidates, allow the unit to expand its program offerings, and increase its partnerships within the community. The institution has shown its dedication to highlighting the SOE as one of its foundational programs by accommodating its need for additional office space. The increase of space has expanded by more than 8,000 square feet since the last onsite visit. Finally, the unit has aggressively and successfully secured additionally resources to support high-quality programs. According to the president, the task for the unit for the next few years is to engage in the process of self-evaluation to shore up the programs currently offered, tighten up those programs that need additional attention to detail, to perhaps collapse programs that are no longer significant in the 21st century education model, and to ensure programs offered are relevant to the needs of the institution and the P-12 community and aligned with the mission of the institution.

6.3. Movement to the Target Level. What steps has the unit taken to move to the target level (if appropriate to this standard)**? What plans does the unit have to continue to move to the target level?**
While the unit's institutional report does not directly address the steps taken to move to the target level, it is apparent by its commitment to continuous improvement resulting in substantial changes made in the areas of unit leadership, budgetary allocations, increased support staff, increased office and facility space occupied, and additional resources secured, including technology, that the unit has taken steps to move to the target level in the area of governance and resources. The following strengths cited validates that the unit has moved to the target level.

6.4. Strengths. What areas of the standard are being addressed at the target level?
The unit provides the leadership for effectively coordinating all programs. The unit's recruiting and admission practices are described clearly and consistently in publications and catalogs. The unit ensures that candidates have access to student services such as advising and counseling. The unit and other faculty collaborate with P–12 practitioners in program design, delivery, and evaluation of the unit and its programs. Colleagues in other units at the institution involved in the preparation of professional educators, school personnel, and other organizations recognize the unit as a leader. The unit provides professional development on effective teaching for faculty in other units of the institution.

Unit budgetary allocations permit faculty teaching, scholarship, and service that extend beyond the unit to P–12 education and other programs in the institution. The budget for curriculum, instruction, faculty, clinical work, scholarship, etc., supports high-quality work within the unit and its school partners.

Workload policies and practices permit and encourage faculty not only to be engaged in a wide range of professional activities, including teaching, scholarship, assessment, advisement, work in schools, and service, but also to professionally contribute on a community, state, regional, or national basis. The unit's use of part-time faculty and of graduate teaching assistants is purposeful and employed to strengthen programs. Unit provision of support personnel significantly enhances the effectiveness of faculty in their teaching and mentoring of candidates. The unit supports professional development activities that engage faculty in dialogue and skill development related to emerging theories and practices.

The unit has outstanding facilities on campus and with partner schools to support candidates in meeting standards. Facilities support the most recent developments in technology that allow faculty to model the use of technology and candidates to practice its use for instructional purposes.

The unit aggressively and successfully secures resources to support high quality and exemplary programs and projects to ensure that candidates meet standards. The unit serves as an information technology resource in education beyond the education programs—to the institution, community, and other institutions. Faculty and candidates have access to exemplary library, curricular, and electronic information resources that serve not only the unit but also a broader constituency.

6.5 Areas for Improvement: None

AFIs Corrected from last visit:
The unit lacks sufficient personnel and data management resources to support the instructional, advising, clinical, and assessment activities necessary to maintain program quality and coherence. (ITP & ADV)

Rationale
The unit employs a team of support personnel that undergird the work of the unit. The staff, including support staff, administrative staff, advisors, personnel devoted to assessment, development staff, and instructional technology support, has grown from 11 in 2003 to 45 in 2010. Additionally, the unit employs 105 student workers, up from 41 in 2003. Student workers are assigned as teaching assistants, research assistants, graduate assistants, and work study students. The unit has hired two academic advisors, allowing the faculty more time to assist candidates in a professional advising capacity.

6.6 Recommendation: Met (Initial)
                                            Met (Advanced)

California State Team Decision: Standard is Met

CTC COMMON STANDARDS NOT ADDRESSED
BY NCATE UNIT STANDARDS

CTC Common Standard 1.1   **Met**

> *The education unit implements and monitors a credential recommendation process that ensures that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.*

Loyola Marymount has procedures in place for each credential program where program leadership and administrative staff verify that each candidate has met credential requirements.

Candidates electronically submit their request for a credential recommendation to the Credential Office. The request, along with official transcripts, and other supporting documentation is thoroughly reviewed to ensure completeness and eligibility for program completion. Once verified, the credential analyst submits an electronic recommendation to the Commission. The Credential Office manager monitors the process to ensure that candidates recommended for a credential have met all requirements.

LMU has also implemented a process to monitor credential recommendations by reviewing a percentage of credentials recommended to ensure accuracy and consistency. The Credential Office sends out a survey through LiveText each term so program completers are able to provide feedback and improve Credential Office services.

CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance   **Met**

> *Qualified members of the Unit are assigned and available to advise applicants and candidates about their academic, professional and personal development, and to assist in their professional placement. Appropriate information is accessible to guide each candidate's attainment of all program requirements. The Unit provides support to candidates who need special assistance, and retains in each program only those candidates who are suited for entry or advancement in the education profession.*

Program directors, faculty and staff provide information to candidates on the requirements for credential programs. Much of this is accomplished through the LMU SOE website. Candidate progress is monitored at both the course and program level. Again, technology is used to enhance the process. In many programs candidates submit work and receive feedback via Live Text. Candidate progress in the program can be monitored electronically. In addition, candidate files with checklists monitor progress.

Candidates and program completers noted that advisors and faculty assist with providing information about program options, course scheduling and special assistance as needed.

Program Reports

Multiple & Single Subject Credential Programs
Multiple & Single Subject Credential Programs with Internship
Multiple & Single Subject Credential Programs with
BCLAD Option (Spanish and Mandarin)

Program Design

The Multiple and Single Subject Programs with a Bilingual/Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (BCLAD) option are influenced by a vision of teacher preparation based on the Mission and Goals of Loyola Marymount University and the School of Education. The School of Education Conceptual Framework also informs the vision of teacher preparation. The conceptual framework focuses on educational success for all learners through respect, empowerment, advocacy, and leadership. It is expected that candidates who complete the Multiple and Single Subject Programs manifest the dispositions to: value and respect all individuals; promote social justice; promote cultural responsiveness; integrate theory and practice; develop moral, intellectual, responsible and caring leaders; and collaborate and share leadership across communities.

The School of Education offers candidates two tracks for completing the credential program since the needs of candidates who are not teaching and those who are teaching are very different. Both of these tracks offer the Spanish and Mandarin Bilingual emphasis authorization option for Multiple and Single Subject candidates. Candidates and faculty alike expressed enthusiasm for this new Bilingual option and spoke about the service this option provides to Mandarin-speaking students throughout the region. Fieldwork is integrated throughout the foundation courses for the candidates in the traditional programs so they are able to have an understanding of the reality of California schooling. After completing the prerequisite courses, candidates begin taking courses in teaching methodology where they study the state-adopted content standards, and issues in promoting literacy for all learners including a focused study of methodology that promotes the achievement of English language learners. The traditional program culminates with a full semester of student teaching in a culturally diverse classroom.

Because the teacher/intern candidates are faced with the need to apply material that is learned in the program almost immediately, the course sequence for this track is different from the traditional teacher preparation program. Candidates begin the program in the summer semester prior to their first day of teaching with a course on working with English Language Learners and an introduction to the field of teaching. Flexible intern options, including Saturday classes, are offered for individuals who are currently teaching in local Catholic schools as well as participants in the Teach for America Program. Through a grant from the Gates Foundation, a teaching residency program is planned for fall 2010. In this program, candidates will have a full-time student teaching experience in a public school classroom with a master teacher and will be supported financially.

A department chair who also serves as the Director of both the Multiple and Single Subjects Programs leads the Elementary and Secondary Education Department. There is also an Assistant Director for both the Multiple and Single Subjects Programs. There is a Program Director and

Assistant Director for the Bilingual Elementary and Secondary Programs and an additional chair of Specialized Programs in Urban Education. In response to growing enrollment, the Department of Clinical Education was formed in 2006 to manage and support candidates' clinical practices. An Assistant Dean leads this department and staff who support candidates in multiple public school districts; several charter schools, as well as schools in the Los Angeles Archdiocese.

Within the School of Education there are both formal and informal venues for communication, including: regular meetings between the Credentials staff and Academic Advisors, faculty meetings at the department and program levels, clinical staff meetings, advisory meetings, monthly meetings with the leadership of the Undergraduate Teacher Preparation group, and meetings held twice a semester of the University-wide Teacher Education Committee.

Curriculum
Candidates are exposed to research that allows them to make decisions that will develop literacy in all learners, especially English language learners and students with learning differences. Through research based instruction, reading assignments, field experiences, reflection, and the use of technology, candidates learn how to teach basic reading skills. Candidates learn how to teach phonics, comprehension skills, writing, and the appreciation of literature. For each single subject content area there are separate methods classes where candidates are afforded the opportunity to focus on subject-specific pedagogy.

Candidates are provided with multiple opportunities to understand how to work with students with disabilities, those who are on behavior plans, as well as students who are gifted and talented. In all fieldwork related courses, candidates demonstrate that they are able to access resources in the school. They attend IEP meetings whenever necessary and possible. Candidates learn to work with specialists and understand how these specialists can support classroom instruction for students with special needs. Faculty and program administrators reiterated how this is achieved in the stand-alone courses and well as integrated in all other courses. Candidates begin the program with foundational level courses, followed by the courses in teaching methodology where they study the state-adopted content standards, and issues in promoting literacy for all learners including a focused study of methodology that promotes the achievement of English language learners.

The faculty and administration have made a major commitment to the use of technology to support student learning. Funds from state intern grants have supported this commitment for public school interns, and program leadership expressed hope that resources would continue to be forthcoming to keep up with this ever-changing landscape for all teacher candidates.

LMU offers cohort models and more flexible course sequencing based on individual candidates' needs. Candidates and graduates spoke positively about the program options and the flexible schedules that could be created. Moreover candidates and graduates praised the advisors and program leadership for being responsive to individual needs.

Field Experience

Candidates in the traditional teacher preparation program or the teacher practitioner/intern program participate in systematic field experiences that form a cohesive set of learning experiences. Every course in the program has a fieldwork requirement where candidates are asked to actively participate in a K-12 classroom. Through these required field experiences, candidates gain a clear understanding of the realities of California public schools and are able to connect what they are learning in the university classroom to the K-12 classroom. Field experiences are designed to be a collaborative effort between candidates, K-12 practitioners, and university personnel.

Experienced master teachers and University supervisors praised the effectiveness of LMU's student teachers. Clinical staff reported that LMU personnel observe prospective master teachers in their classrooms before securing a placement for each student teacher. Early field experiences/observations are required for all candidates—prospective student teachers and interns—and the candidates secure places where they can complete course assignments given the parameters noted in course syllabi. Several students teaching in the Catholic schools program expressed a desire for greater assistance in arranging their public school observations, which they conduct in the summer where it is challenging to find summer school classes offering more than remedial programs. This seemed to be more prevalent for high school teachers.

Making the connections from theory to practice is a foundation of LMU's programs, and candidates, faculty and district personnel reiterated this commitment. In interviews, program completers noted that now that they are in the field, they see how well connected their experiences in theory and practice had been and how meaningful that was in their current practice. During an interview with several full-time faculty members, it was noted that they planned to strengthen this connection by creating means for greater articulation between the coursework and fieldwork.

Assessment of Candidates

Throughout the coursework, all candidates have multiple opportunities to demonstrate the skills and abilities embodied in the Teaching Performance Expectations. Candidates also participate in pedagogical assignments that allow them to become familiar with the tasks of the Teaching Performance Assessment. By the time candidates enroll in Student Teaching or Culminating Experience, they have already completed a number of tasks in the Teaching Performance Assessment. Cal TPA Task 4 is completed as part of the culminating coursework (in Student Teaching for candidates in the traditional teacher preparation program and Culminating Experience for teacher practitioners/interns). It serves as one culminating experience for candidates and is administered towards the end of the program. By the time candidates complete Task 4, they have taken all of their courses in the program and thus have received support in lesson design, assessment, and modification of instruction.

During the supervised field experience, candidates are evaluated based on the Teaching Performance Expectations. LMU has been a pioneer with respect to the state-mandated teaching performance assessment. Faculty leadership were involved in the original design, pilot studies and benchmarking as early as 2003. They were one of the first programs to fully operationalize the Cal TPA and have a highly successful system for all aspects of its implementation. TPA data

is presented by the TPA Coordinator to the entire faculty on a regular basis, and several program modifications have been made based on these data. Another significant commitment to candidate assessment is evidenced in the fact that LMU participates in the California State University's Annual Follow-up Study administered by the Center for Teacher Quality.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Education Specialist Credential Program
Mild to Moderate

Program Design
The program was designed after much consultation with SOE faculty, advisory committees, other Special Education faculty and representatives from Los Angeles Unified School District. Candidates for the Mild/Moderate Specialist Credential may enter the program as either undergraduate or graduate students and may pursue the credential with either an elementary or secondary emphasis. An internship program is also in place in order to support and prepare teachers who are employed as special education interns.

The Mild/Moderate Specialist Credential Program Level I was approved in 1997 and candidates were formally admitted in January of 1998. The Level II program began accepting candidates in spring of 2000 but is currently not admitting new students and candidates currently in the program will finish the program by the end of the current academic year.

The Level I program is in transition as the program faculty reviews the current program and respond to the new standards as evidenced in their transition plan submitted to CTC.

The vision for the preparation of candidates who aspire to be teachers of students with Mild/Moderate disabilities is based upon the Mission and Goals of the Loyola Marymount University (LMU) School of Education. The faculty, staff and students declare its purpose to be the encouragement of life-long learning and academic excellence, the education of the whole person, and the promotion of service and justice for all. One goal of the School of Education as well as the program is to work collaboratively in a student-centered environment to be professionals that is consistent with the university mission and SOE conceptual framework.

Coordination of the Program is the responsibility of the Program Director, a tenured faculty member in the School of Education with expertise in Mild/Moderate disabilities. In addition, a clinical faculty member in Special Education, the Assistant Director, also assists in the coordination of the program. The program also works closely with the Department of Clinical Practice in placing student teachers in the traditional program.

The Program Director works closely with the Chair of the Department of Educational Support Services and all the other Directors both informally and formally through the Academic Program Directors which meets on as needed basis and through faculty meetings.

In interviews with the credential analysts, clinical practice department, supervisors, and students in the intern program there is evidence that communication is collaborative, effective and geared toward helping students navigate through the program.

There were a number of program modifications in the two years prior to the site visit, including but not limited to:
- the development of a portfolio requirement prior to completion of program and recommendation for credential,
- change in sequence of coursework to meet the needs of Interns,

- Fieldwork coordinated by new Department of Clinical Education,
- Redesign of the Disposition/Observation form to be used by University Supervisors,
- Increased content in pre-service courses and development of modules related to English Learners,
- Addition of signature assignments to courses,
- Demonstration of lesson prior to being admitted to student teaching,
- the adjustment of University Supervisor visits to include observation of candidate in IEP meetings and conducting an assessment of a student with exceptional needs (IWEN),
- the receipt of a 325T grant from US Department of Education Office of Special Education Programs to restructure program,
- the creation of a new Advisory Board for the Program, and
- the addition to coursework of intervention design and implementation with progress monitoring.

Representatives of the Special Education advisory group were interviewed and confirmed that they were involved on a regular basis with the program director and faculty regarding curriculum, fieldwork and assessment. They reported being impressed by the effort of faculty to improve the program and stressed the importance of the program including advocacy as a part of the mission.

Curriculum
All Special Education candidates take core courses that provide an overview of current educational theory and best practices in education. After completing these classes, candidates take specialized methodology courses that prepare them to work at either the elementary or secondary school level. Depending on their background and employment status, MA/Credential candidates can enroll on either the Traditional track or the Intern track.

Field Experience
Integrated fieldwork is a critical component of the program. It is essential that theory be linked with practice for candidates to become effective special educators. Consequently, field experience with diverse populations is required throughout the program.

Even before beginning the program or concurrently with the prerequisite course work, traditional candidates must document experience with culturally and linguistically diverse students with and without disabilities outside of the program. Private school teaching, tutoring, teaching assistantship, church work, and recreation agencies are examples of experience that is suitable. Candidates indicate their experience on their application and/or on letterhead.

Field experience begins with initial courses such as EDUC 5300 Introduction to Teaching and Learning in General and Special Education Programs and 5301 Managing Learning Environments and EDUC 444 Observation and Participation in General and Special Education Program. These courses were added to the program to enable Interns/ Teacher Practitioners and undergraduate candidates more systematic opportunities to participate and reflect on activities and experiences including a broad spectrum of interactions with diverse populations.

Field experience continues with all the courses with fieldwork assignments built into all courses. To advance to student teaching, candidates must have been successful in the assigned field

experiences.   If the Director of the Clinical Department receives a report from the field stating that a candidate has not seemed to profit from the on-site visit or receives information that the candidate is not ready to advance to student teaching or the final fieldwork assessment, the candidate's advancement is thoroughly examined and denied if necessary.

The final field experience course, EDUC 456/EDUC 644/5981 - 5984 Field Experience with Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities requires a minimum of 15 weeks of full-time teaching in a public or private school program that is appropriate for the age and type of disability of the children/youth required by the credential. This experience allows for candidates to have the opportunity to consult and collaborate with teachers, students, families, administrators, specialists, and other related service and agency personnel during this time. Intern candidates are supervised by a a University supervisor and an On-Site Support Provider. Student Teachers are supervised by a Master Teacher and a University Supervisor. All persons supervising Interns and Student Teachers must possess the required credentials.

School sites for the field experiences for all candidates are carefully selected to meet the individual needs of the candidates as well as to meet program goals. The guidelines for the field experiences include:
1. cultural and linguistic diversity in the student population in the classroom and school site;
2. placement at different age and/or grade levels in both general and special education; and
3. placement in classrooms with different approaches to organization and classroom management

A long history of cooperative work with local schools and settings for elementary and secondary field placements has enabled the program to build relationships and networks through which the program identifies outstanding field placements. For traditional candidates who are not teaching full-time, the Department of Clinical Education works closely with cooperating school districts to select those school sites and master teachers who can provide an optimum experience for candidates enrolled in their final field experience/directed teaching.

Training in the role of fieldwork supervision is ongoing, and takes place both formally and informally. Fieldwork supervisors are updated on any recent and significant changes in the field through regularly scheduled meetings. The Coordinator of Field Experiences provides additional updated information during early visits to the field sites. Interviews with university supervisors and candidates in the special education program confirmed that there is close collaboration between their master teachers or intern coaches and the program. University supervisors were impressed by the attention given to reviewing their feedback to candidates and the ability of the program to develop an action plan for candidates that were not successful in the early stages of the program.

Assessment of Candidates
The determination of the competence of each candidate is based on a variety of factors and is conducted at multiple points in the program. Ultimately, the determination of candidate competence is the responsibility of the Program Director. The director is able to effectively evaluate all aspects of the candidate's course work, directed teaching, and other qualifications. Before a candidate is recommended, each candidate has an exit interview with the Program

Director and Assistant Director to discuss the candidate's readiness to be recommended for the credential as well as the strengths and limitations of the program.

The candidate's competence is also evaluated through the final field experience/directed teaching. The master teacher completes a formative and summative evaluation via Livetext. On-site providers complete a summative assessment each semester via Livetext. Master Teachers and On-site provider receive training, information, and documentation forms from the Fieldwork Coordinators.

The University Supervisor formally observes and gives feedback to the candidate six times a semester.). These observations and feedback session are comprised of observation of a lesson taught by the Candidate, observation of a formal assessment and observation of the Candidate participating or preparing for an IEP meeting. At the conclusion of the final field experience/directed teaching, the University Supervisor completes a final evaluation of the candidate's competence with regards to the standards of the Program. This documentation is shared with the candidate and the Fieldwork Coordinator and entered into LiveText.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, and administrators, the team determined that all program standards are met. This program will also be transitioning to the new standards in the near future.

Multiple and Single Subject Clear 2042

Program Design

The LMU 2042 Professional Clear Credential program was approved in 2000 and consists of four courses. The eight unit Clear Credential program can be taken as a one year stand-alone program for those who have a preliminary credential and at least 22 units past their BA, or in conjunction with the Literacy Education Master's degree program. The Master's degree option is for those candidates who do not have the additional units. Candidates for the Professional Clear Credential enter the program as graduate students. The candidate population is comprised of graduates of the LMU/LA Catholic Archdiocesan School Teachers (CAST) Multiple Subjects Credential and Single Subject Credential programs, as well as from Partners in Los Angeles Catholic Education (PLACE) program. Additional candidates are K -12 practitioners in the field, who are teaching at a Catholic, charter or private schools that does not offer an induction program.

Curriculum

EDES 6080 Advanced Coursework I (3 units)
EDES 6965 Action Research Fieldwork Support 1 (1 unit)
EDES 6081 Advanced Coursework II (3 units)
EDES 6966 Action Research Fieldwork Support 2 (1 unit)

Field Experience

The program adopted the Formative Assessment for California Teachers (FACT) as the assessment tool for the fieldwork component of the program. The fieldwork culminates in a Summative Evaluation by university supervisors based on the CSTPs. Supervisors make several informal and formal visits to the candidate's classrooms during the year and complete formative evaluations based on dispositions and CSTP's. At the end of the year, all of these are taken into consideration when supervisors aggregate the information using a FACT template. Candidates in the program swap schools for a day so that they are able to experience different settings.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

The 2042 program has adopted a number of assessment measures throughout the program. The Signature Assignment in the course EDES 6081Advanced Coursework II asks candidates to complete and reflect upon an assignment using their own students for one of their course modules. Candidates complete the assignment and submit it on LiveText. Assignments are evaluated using a rubric on LiveText. Students also complete an electronic portfolio that is created on their own website in LiveText and insert artifacts and assignments from each of the 4 modules as well as their fieldwork. Candidates are asked to respond to an exit survey at the end of the program. The questions correlate to the SOE conceptual framework. These questions focus on issues related to teaching students with exceptional needs, working with English language learners, responding to social justice concerns, and the integration of theory and practice.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, and administrators, the team determined that all program standards are met. This program will also be transitioning to the new standards in the near future.

California Teachers English Learners (CTEL)

Program Design

Loyola Marymount University School of Education's time-honored and strong commitment to equity and social justice, its attention to the linguistically and culturally responsive instructional needs of English Learners is evident in the program's written goal statement:

> *We recognize diversity as a strength and we commit ourselves personally and professionally to serve culturally and linguistically diverse populations. These populations include those who represent cultural diversity broadly defined, including race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, gender, religion, sexual orientation, ability, and age. Among other valuable theories and approaches, we utilize sociocultural and constructivist perspectives in teaching and learning. We value these and other perspectives that promote active participation in learning, meaningful and authentic instruction and assessment, and emphasize students' cultural and linguistic background experience.*

In 2006, the University launched the Center for Equity and Excellence in English Learner Education and Research. Under the leadership of the CTEL Director, the Center's entire focus is the achievement of English Learners. The Center conducts research and professional development activities to this end. The Loyola Marymount University School of Education leadership team for the CTEL program includes highly qualified faculty and administrators with extensive experience in teacher training and English Learner instruction.

The program provides candidates with a strong theoretical foundation in first and second language development, practical application for instruction of English language development (ELD) and Specially Designed Academic Instruction in English (SDAIE), as well as an understanding of theory and practice from a linguistic, sociolinguistic, anthropological, and cognitive perspective.

Curriculum

LMU's CTEL program is a 12-unit upper division, graduate-level curriculum designed to meet the professional needs of teachers who must fulfill California's Crosscultural Language and Academic Development (CLAD) requirements. With the consent of the Program Director, some of the coursework can be applied to an LMU MA program. The CTEL program operates on a hybrid model, with two of the courses taught face-to-face at LMU, and the other two taught online.

Field Experience

Through course study and assignments including fieldwork, lesson planning, language/literacy assessments, interviews of students, families, and teachers, candidates develop an awareness of first- and second-language development and their relation to academic achievement, in preparation for effective instruction of English learners in the classrooms. Assignments examine cultural similarities and differences in addition to theoretical perspective in first and second language acquisition and teaching methodologies.

Assessment of Candidates

Loyola Marymount University School of Education CTEL courses provide a variety of measures to assess candidates' course work. For example, candidates participate in a variety of academic tasks including oral presentations, research projects, lesson planning, and conducting language and literacy profiles of students.

Faculty provide on-going assessments throughout each course in order to provide constructive feedback to candidates on their understanding of concepts and issues, development of skills and knowledge in regard to teaching and learning of English learners. Assessment practices include the use of rubrics for the evaluation of candidate work. To ensure continuity and consistency in coursework, signature assignments have been identified and implemented in all courses.

As a final assessment of their academic preparation, candidates in the CTEL program participate in a culminating experience that may include an exit interview and/or portfolio presentation.

The School of Education uses *Live Text* as a tool to track student progress over time. Candidates also meet with the Program Director who monitors candidate progress.

The CTEL program is a recently approved program and at the time of the site visit has just one candidate who will complete the program at the end of the spring semester and two students in the pipeline. The program requirements overlap with the Teaching English as a Second Language (TESL) program, a 33-unit curriculum leading to a Master's (MA) degree. The program director and admissions staff are working on recruiting more students to make the program viable.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Reading Certificate
Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential Programs

Program Design
Basic skills and knowledge about literacy, and both theory and practice, are found in the Reading Certificate program while more advanced knowledge and skills are presented in the Reading/Language Arts Specialist Credential program. The Reading Certificate program is designed to provide candidates with a sound knowledge base concerning reading pedagogy and practice. The goal is to help all students succeed in the classroom and to promote intensive intervention for struggling students. The program provides candidates with a theoretical knowledge of best reading practices with practical experiences in the classroom and clinical settings. Candidates for the Reading Certificate enter the program as graduate students. The student population is comprised of graduates of the LMU Multiple Subjects Credential program and the Single Subject Credential program, as well as from K -12 practitioners in the field, who are seeking graduate work in the field of literacy.

Coordination of both programs is the responsibility of a tenured faculty member, the Program Director, in the School of Education who possesses a Life Reading Specialist Credential, and has had extensive experience in the field. The Assistant Program Director, who is a graduate of the Literacy Program, plays an integral part in the coordination of the program as well as serving as the Literacy Lab Coordinator. The Program Director and Assistant Director have the responsibility for course content, selection and advising of candidates, and program evaluation. The Program Director and the Assistant Director teach most of the classes in the program.

Curriculum
The Reading Certificate program requires five classes and may be taken in conjunction with a Master's degree program in Child and Adolescent Literacy. The Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential program requires an additional 6 classes or 18 units after completion of the Reading Certificate program. The courses in the sequence provide the basic knowledge of the reading process from beginning readers to those who are fluent and independent readers.   The texts allow students to understand the interrelationship between research foundations and implementation of the California Standards to effectively teach literacy skills at all levels. These texts include theories of the reading process, a description of the critical literacy curriculum, instructional principles, and descriptions of current approaches to reading. These theories and principles are then applied throughout the text to illustrate the integration of theory and practice. Current research on comprehension and strategies for implementation are addressed in four of the five classes necessary for the Reading Certificate.

Current research on comprehension and strategies for implementation are addressed in four of the five classes necessary for the Reading Certificate. Exploration of the many facets of comprehension is accomplished through the texts, required readings and lectures. Interviews with students confirmed that students are familiar with major theorists in this content area and are able to apply these theories to their practice of teaching and assessing reading. In interviews with program faculty it was evident they have a broad based foundation that assists students in familiarizing them with major theories, critiquing them, and seeking ways to implement them in their field experience and classrooms.

The program faculty stated that they enjoy collaborating with their colleagues and appreciate their differing areas of expertise. This collaboration is echoed in cooperative assignments at the LMU Literacy Lab where candidates work with individual students under close supervision and evaluation by faculty. Interviews with students confirmed that they receive experiences with students at different ability levels and grade level from where they currently teach.

Field Experience
The purpose of the fieldwork component for the Reading/Language Arts Specialist credential is two-fold. First, it provides experience in the teaching of reading/language arts in grades K-12. Secondly, it provides opportunities for candidates to experience and participate in the variety of duties associated with a leadership position in a school and/or school district. Integrated field work is a critical component of the program. It is essential that theory be linked with practice for candidates to become effective teachers of reading/language arts. Field experience with diverse populations is required throughout the program. Much of the field work is completed in the candidates' classrooms and, since the majority of our students teach in culturally and/or linguistically diverse settings, candidates have the opportunity to apply their knowledge with children who reflect a culture different from their own.
The LMU Literacy Lab has been in existence for approximately 30 years, servicing children in the area from Kindergarten to 12th grade.   Children who attend the Literacy Lab reflect the diversity of the area around the university. In interviews with students they valued the opportunity to work with students at a level different from their own classroom, and then to reflect on what they had learned from the experience and gain feedback from their peers and professors.

Assessment of Candidate Competence
LMU has designed signature assignments for each of the Reading Certificate and Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential classes. Detailed intervention plans are checked weekly by the University Director and/or the Lab Coordinator to ensure that effective practices are being utilized and that the needs of all students, including English language learners, are being met.

A Summative Performance Collection (SPC) and Exit Interview are required at the completion of the Reading Language Arts Specialist Credential classes. Both the Literacy Portfolio and the Summative Performance Collection are compilations of many of the program assignments which measure competence and demonstrate application of skills and knowledge gained in the program.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, and administrators, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Services Credential Programs

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential
Professional Administrative Services Credential

Program Design

The LMU Preliminary and Professional Administrative Services Credentials are part of the School of Education's Institute of School Leadership and Administration (ISLA), which was a major change in the program title. This change included the development of a collaborative effort amongst the LMU School of Education's ISLA, the Special Education Programs, the Catholic School Programs, the Bilingual/Bicultural Programs and targeted support from the Disability Rights Legal Center at Loyola Law School, The Learning Rights Law Center, the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), and the California Charter School Association (CCSA). The ISLA also includes options for candidates focus on the Charter School Leadership and the Catholic School Leadership Academies, as well as earn a Masters Degree in School Administration and Catholic School Administration

LMU's Preliminary Administrative Services Credential program is specifically designed to prepare candidates for administration positions in public, private, charter, and Catholic schools. The Tier I curriculum may be taken as a stand-alone program (requiring 19 units), or can be combined with an MA in School Administration or MA in Catholic School Administration programs. The Tier I program is only open to candidates who hold a valid California credential (i.e., a cleared teaching credential, PPS credential, or Library Science credential) and have a minimum of one year full-time experience with that credential.

The Professional Administrative Services Credential program is a 3-unit program designed for candidates who already hold the Preliminary Administrative Services (Tier I) Credential and have secured a position in administration. The Tier II program is completed in one semester. It is primarily taught online, with scheduled class meetings required. Candidates in this program are expected to reflect on the knowledge and skills they have acquired as educational leaders, and in turn to create a professional development plan for future growth.

This program admits in the Spring semester only. Qualified candidates in LMU's Doctoral Program may earn the Tier II Administrative Services Credential as they complete their doctoral coursework. There is an Internship program available, however, there are currently no candidates in that program.

Based on program data collected and analyzed, modifications to the program have been made in the following areas:
  *There has been a change in the program title to the Institute of School Leadership and Administration (ISLA).
  *The program has been changed to a cohort based model.
  *There have been changes in course names and syllabi have been standardized. Expected program outcomes, skills, knowledge, and dispositions have been regrouped thematically and

by standards. All course work content has been aligned with the CCTC Standards, the CPSELs, the ISLLC, the Council for Exceptional Children, and the PROMISE Initiative Core Principles for Advocacy-Oriented Administrative and Leadership Systems for English Language Learners.

*Fieldwork has been embedded into the content and curriculum of the Tier I core courses.

*Candidate and program assessments are facilitated through LiveText, a web-based assessment tool, to create an electronic portfolio, as evidence of personal and professional learning and growth.

Program Leadership interviewed indicated that these changes have greatly improved standardization and coherence in the program as well as adding a stronger emphasis on English Learner and Special Education instructional needs. Candidates reported that the reorganization of fieldwork linked to each segment of coursework made the program significantly more meaningful and productive in achieving student learning outcomes. Leadership indicated that the change in the structure of meetings has enhanced the coordination and refinement of coursework and fieldwork. The first cohort graduated in May 2009. Completers reported that they experienced peer support from the new cohort model.

Curriculum
LMU coursework in preparation of candidates for the Preliminary Administrative Services Credential includes the following required core courses:

EDUC 6420 An Invitation to Lead (1 unit)
EDUC 6421 Vision of Learning for Diverse Students, Families, Staff, and Community
EDUC 6422 Responding to Diversity of Students, Families, Staff, and Community
EDUC 6423 Student Learning and Professional Growth for Diverse Students, Families, Staff, and Community
EDUC 6424 Organizational Management for Student Learning: Political, Economic, and Legal Frames of Diverse Students, Families, Staff, and Community
EDUC 6425 Transforming Organizations for Diverse Students, Families, Staff, and Community

The culminating course for Tier I is a comprehensive assessment, EDUC 6995 Primed for Action. The coursework takes place over three semesters with culminating presentations on a weekend.

Required coursework for Professional Administrative Services includes the following:
EDUC 6415 Professional Administrative Induction and Assessment Seminar.

Candidates must also secure a mentor in their local districts. Staff and students indicated that this method is working much better than the previous method where they were assigned to a site other than their work site. Candidates, completers, leadership and faculty reported that the reorganization of the coursework to "frontload" the program with research and methodology coursework and embed fieldwork throughout the coursework sequence, has significantly improved candidate engagement and outcomes.

Field Experience
Candidates complete their fieldwork primarily at their own work site. The University Supervisors work cooperatively with the site administrator supervising and advising the candidates. The Site Supervisor Manual indicates that the Fieldwork in Residency is three semesters long with one project per semester. There is one project for Unit 1 and one for Unit 2 and another project for Units 3 and 4.

All Tier I candidates must successfully complete fieldwork requirements, and participate in culminating presentation, that demonstrate evidence of learning and growth.

Fieldwork projects incorporate theory and practice into school issues with theoretical concepts in school administration/leadership and the conceptual framework of LMU: Respect, Educate, Advocate, and Lead (REAL). Using real work site problems, at their own sites has provided students an excellent opportunity to apply their research and classroom learning while resolving an issue that helped their work site.

Students are evaluated by rubrics developed by LMU University staff and available to students. The Rubric is a comprehensive five-step format that gives examples from "Exceeds Expectations, Standards, and Competencies, to Not Evident, or Not Acceptable". Interviews with candidates and faculty indicated that knowing the rubric ahead of time assisted students in reaching the department expectations.

The University Supervisor, site administrator, University Advisor, and University professors all advise candidates. According to site and LMU staff interviewed, they work together in a cohesive manner to make certain that students are exposed to a variety of real life site projects and are involved in three fieldwork projects that are supervised by both site administration and LMU staff. Supervisors meet regularly to assure the success of candidates. At these regularly scheduled meetings supervisors share concerns and candidate progress, and refine the benchmarks. Site and university supervisors attend an annual meeting which clarifies expectations about the breadth and depth of fieldwork required.
.
In conversations with administrators who work with LMU ED AD Grads, and 3 of 4 who are Administrative Services program graduates, all agreed that administrative services graduates are ready to move right into the role of instructional and site leadership. Graduates have ample administrative experiences prior to recommendation for a credential. They are competent in instructional supervision, content-based instructional practices, and how to lead school sites and instructional programs. They are vocationally prepared to serve in urban settings and work with students and families in this region. Local district administrators reported that LMU candidates are highly sought after.

Interviews with faculty confirmed that program changes improved the fieldwork component by "pulling together theory and practice to better prepare for current job conditions".

Assessment of Candidates
The program includes a comprehensive and systematic assessment process linked to the School of Education Assessment System and the state standards. The credential staff work closely with staff and students to assure that, upon completion, the students have met all of their requirements.

Interviews with faculty and candidates indicated that ongoing advising appointments are consistently used to assess students and advise them. The department advisor, University advisors and Professors accomplish the advising process.

Summative assessment consists of fieldwork evaluation that is linked to the state standards of competency and performance. Assessment is completed using a variety of rubrics and the signature portfolio developed on "Live Text".

Each student meets with the University advisor at least once each semester individually. They often communicate by email or participate as a member of a class with which the advisor is meeting.

Assessment information is on the department web site and is an integral part of the "Live Text" program. The "LiveText" program is used develop the student signature portfolio and is a comprehensive communication tool between student and professor. Both students and staff indicated that this tool was very helpful and assisted with feedback and organization.

Program leadership and faculty reported that any candidate in need of extra help was assisted through tutorials, podcasts, counseling and individual conferences. An example of the success rate of candidates, included information provided in interviews that in the first cohort, "thirteen of fifteen of the candidates were placed as administrators after program completion".

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

Pupil Personnel Services
School Psychology Services Credential Program

Program Design
The School Psychology program philosophies and goals articulate a clear commitment to diversity, which are reflected in the recruitment and selection of candidates, course content, faculty scholarly work, and design of candidate experiences for Practica and Internship. The program ensures a diverse pool of cohort candidates each year through its selection process. During admissions, one of two articles required for reading and discussion at the mandatory group interview is an article by Sonia Nieto. Members of the selection committee note applicants' reactions and comments regarding this article, as well as other characteristics on an observation form, which is used as part of the selection process.

The program faculty continues to believe that school psychologists must be able to address a multiplicity of needs presented by the diversity of students, their families, teachers, administrators, and communities. Thus, they de-emphasize testing. Although important, this skill is but a point of departure in the "helping relationships" school psychologists establish and maintain. LMU graduates must possess theory-based practice in order to effectively collaborate side by side with teachers, administrators, and parents to promote education equity and meet mental health needs of diverse student populations. They must assist schools in collecting useful data to make important decisions and program innovations. They must establish liaisons with individuals and agencies in the community to make appropriate resources available to students, their families and the school system. They must demonstrate their commitment to promoting a pluralistic and diverse society, and they must assume leadership in those professional societies which promote the dignity and worth of the children and youth. Candidates interviewed reported that they had been invited to present at the state school psychologist's conference and were very excited about the opportunity. All of the employers and supervisors interviewed said that the LMU school psychologist candidates were well prepared and showed a high level of personal and social responsibility. Social Justice was not just a philosophical goal but also a vital component of their professional practice.

The School Psychology program goals are:
Goal 1:   To provide candidates a high-quality training program that is well organized, with a meaningful and relevant curriculum informed by research and practice.
Goal 2:   To provide candidates a high level of support, which includes attention to the development of the whole person, in order to assist everyone to attain academic excellence and promote life-long learning.
Goal 3:   To develop and train candidates to become highly qualified school psychologists who are culturally responsive to the needs of the diverse student populations in schools.
Goal 4:   To equip candidates with a comprehensive set of knowledge and skills so that they will provide a full range of services as future school psychologists.

Curriculum
The LMU School Psychology program is a comprehensive 63-unit program and is carefully integrated so that each cohort of candidates completes the 21 courses in three years. Courses are

required during fall, spring, and summer. Admissions occur once a year, candidates are admitted together and graduate together at the end of three years of full-time study, with a Master's degree in Educational Psychology and a recommendation for the California State credential to practice as a school psychologist. All courses in the School Psychology program are restricted to School Psychology candidates only, and course content is organized to reflect the knowledge and skills identified by both State (CTC) and National (NASP) standards for training school psychologists. Relevant sections of both sets of standards are stated in each syllabus. Moreover, key content areas spiral through the curriculum, thus insuring that a set of knowledge and/or skills is continually developed with candidates throughout the program.

Field Experience
While the institution believes it is important for candidates to understand the tradition of school psychology practice, it trains candidates to be innovative school psychologists who are equipped with the knowledge and skills to expand their roles to meet the ever changing demands in schools and communities. In all of the courses, they strive to educate candidates about the possibilities of what school psychologists can contribute to schools and communities (e.g., situational leadership opportunities, innovations to promote systems change, meaningful involvement with communities, and implementation of evidence-based prevention and intervention programs).

Assessment of Candidate Competence
Since the initial application in 2006, LMU has focused efforts on establishing policies and practices in order to better track candidates' progress and achievement. They have added specificity to their rubrics and collected more candidate and student data to demonstrate candidates' effectiveness in serving clients. The following are current policies in place to determine candidates' achievement and competence in the program:
- Candidates must maintain a minimum of a B average in the program. Candidates who are unable to do so are placed on academic probation and a plan is put in place to help them meet this requirement.
- Candidates must receive a grade of B- or better in all courses or will be required to retake the course, thus extending the program by a year.
- Candidates must meet minimum standards on all course assignments, as set by the faculty. Candidates are required to re-do and re-submit assignments that do not meet these standards. Grades on re-submitted assignments are averaged with the original grade.
- Candidates are informed that portfolios have a minimum score for passing, and candidates who do not pass are required to revise and resubmit their portfolios.
- Candidates are required to complete/pass practicum before beginning internship. Candidates must possess an internship credential to begin earning internship hours.
- Candidates must earn a score of 600 or higher on the Praxis. Candidates are allowed to take the Praxis twice to meet the passing score. Candidates who are unable to do so are required to pass a written and/or oral exam administered by program faculty.

LMU began using a Candidate Progress Checklist to monitor candidate progress throughout the program, using the 4 benchmarks of the School Of Education Assessment System: Admissions/Beginning Program, Progress to Fieldwork, Culminating Fieldwork, and Exit

Program. An academic advisor ensures that all student records are up-to-date and works closely with faculty to resolve issues.

Employers interviewed reported that they found the school psychologists to be well prepared and that they preferred to hire LMU graduates.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards are met.

<div align="center">**Pupil Personnel Services**
School Counseling Services Credential Program
School Counseling Services Credential Program with Internship</div>

Program Design
The program design clearly defines the steps from initial interview to completion of program, and multiple measures to ensure that candidates develop competency in all program standards. Coursework is designed to introduce candidates to foundational courses in school counseling and then move candidates into more specialized courses. A scholar/practitioner approach in classes introduces candidates to the role of the 21st century professional school counselor, reflecting integration of the latest research and recommendation on comprehensive, developmental, results-based approaches to school counseling. Fieldwork experiences are introduced to candidates once they have mastered foundational classes, and reflect readiness to move into supervised field-experiences.

The program consists of 48 units of graduate level coursework.   Students may take courses at a pace that meets their needs. All of the candidates interviewed attend graduate level classes in the evening after completing a full time "day job." Completion of the program enables the candidate to obtain a Master of Arts degree in Counseling and the Pupil Personnel Services School Counseling credential. The day of the interviews, March 15th, was the day that state law requires school districts to notify credentialed staff if they are going to be re-hired. Two practitioners interviewed reported that they had been laid off, others that their case load was increasing from 1/500 to 1/1200 students. Despite the discouraging news, all of the employers, counselors, faculty and candidates spoke positively about their experience with the program and several candidates said that having completed the LMU program gave them a breadth of experience that would be helpful even if they could not work as a school counselor right away.

Curriculum
The curriculum is designed to introduce concepts in professional school counseling, in alignment with state and national counseling standards. This includes ensuring that candidates understand the role of the school counselor as a leader, advocate, collaborator, and agent of change who teams with other formal and non-formal leaders in school to provide resources for the academic, career, and personal-social success of students. The courses in the curriculum build upon these skills, and prepare candidates to collect, analyze, and use data in schools to ensure that all pupils on campus have equal access to the services they need for success. A new required course, EDSS 6377, Multicultural Counseling, was introduced in 2009. Candidates reported that the class was very meaningful.

Field Experience
Candidates are introduced to field experiences with appropriate support from both university supervisors and site-supervisors. Candidates are provided both individual and group supervision, structured by attending field experience classes and meeting ten to eleven times with their university supervisor during each of their two field experience classes. Candidates keep detailed logs, charting each of their 600 hours of fieldwork experience. Additionally, they develop a fieldwork portfolio to demonstrate experiences they have gained. Candidates complete their field work in two of three levels – elementary, middle or high school, with a minimum of 200

clock hours at any one level. The electronic portfolio enables the student and the faculty to maintain in depth records of the candidate's accomplishments with a minimum of paper. One faculty member said that having all the information available on a flash drive made his reviews and oversight much more efficient, plus saving a lot of trees.

Assessment of Candidate Competence

Candidate competence is assessed throughout the program with all coursework and field experiences focused on development of knowledge, skills, and disposition for the role of a school counselor. Classroom activities and assignments provide for growth and development as a reflective practitioner, and encourage socio-cultural competence. Candidates are assessed in each class in mastery of subject content, and in their field experiences to demonstrate ability to apply theory to practice. Both university and site-supervisors participate in assessment of candidates. The site supervisor's evaluation of the candidate's performance relates directly to the state standards, University goals of the School of Education and broadly with the NCATE standards.

In interviews with school administrators, supervisors, faculty, candidates and graduates, it was apparent that there was a high level of support for the program and for the candidates enrolled in it. The program collects feedback from the advisory board, supervisors and employers as well as the candidates themselves. These data are used to make changes in the program as they are needed. Adjunct faculty reported that their feedback to the program director was well received and acted on.

After review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and after conducting interviews of candidates, graduates, faculty, and administrators, the team determined that all program standards are met.